

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,116	02/03/2006	Junji Kodemura	46700117PUS1 3013	
2292 7590 11/02/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 .			EXAMINER	
			HARLAN, ROBERT D	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/567,116	KODEMURA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Robert D. Harlan	1796	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports.	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from . cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. & 133).	
Status				
2a) <u></u>	Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	o3 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	on of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	wn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the edrawing(s) is objected to by the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
12)⊠ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
2)	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	

Application/Control Number: 10/567,116 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

## DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere*Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasquier et al., WO 99/37701 (hereinafter "Pasquier"). Pasquier teaches a polymeric composition comprising a polymer P2 obtaining by cross-linking a polymer

Application/Control Number: 10/567,116 Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

prepared by ring opening metathesis of a cycloolefin monomer (A) in the presence of a metathesis polymerization catalyst (D).

See Pasquier, pages 16-20. The polymeric composition further comprises a second polymer of suitable organic materials of high molecular weight comprising copolymers of maleic anhydride with styrene. See Pasquier, page 21. The polymeric composition further comprises fillers and chain transfer agents. See Pasquier, pages 18 and 23. Pasquier further teaches the use of the polymeric composition in different final forms such as molding, coating or injection molding. See Pasquier, page 23.

- 4. Pasquier differs from the present invention in that the present invention does not teach instant invention in a single embodiment. However, Pasquier teaches enough about the objective of transforming polymeric composition into end uses that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine polymers and additives. Such motivation would be met with a reasonable expectation of success because Pasquier makes it clear that all embodiment and components can be used together to achieve the objective of the invention. See Pasquier, page 2.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert D.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,116

Art Unit: 1796

Harlan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10 AM - 8 PM.

- 6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 273-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert D. Harlan Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796 Page 4